

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending herein. Claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In response to the Office Action of March 30, 2004, the claims have been amended as indicated herein.

Claims 6 and 16-18 have been amended to address the technical objections raised by the Examiner.

A substitute Abstract is enclosed addressing the technical objection raised by the Examiner.

A new Declaration and Power of Attorney is enclosed addressing the objection raised by the Examiner.

With respect to the substantive objections raised by the Examiner, and particularly the citation of the Hansen et al. reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) with respect to claims 1-14 and 17-20, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw those objections in view of the amendments submitted with this response and the submissions which follow.

First, the applicant notes that claim 20 has been cancelled from the application.

With respect to claim 1, the applicant has more particularly defined step (b) in the claim, and in particular the step of marking the page displayed in the first display frame with a first identifier. Specifically, the applicant has explained that the marking is in fact a writing of a unique first identifier in and to the page displayed in said first display frame. In other words, as noted in the specification and in previous claim 20,

the applicant is specifically tagging the web page displayed in the first display frame with a unique identifier. In this manner, any page displayed in that first display frame will carry its own unique identifier, independent of the URL of that page.

This is an aspect of the applicant's invention which is neither taught nor suggested by Hansen. Hansen uses a passive method for identifying the page displayed in its first window. Specifically, Hansen et al. relies upon the URL of the page displayed in the frame in order to call up and display a report relating to that URL. While this may work for certain websites, applicant has found that this method is in fact deficient in many e-commerce and business-related sites.

Specifically, the Hansen et al. method does not differentiate between page instances with the same URL as in the case of an e-commerce system that may display thousands of products using one page, typically called "products.asp". This is also true now for many content management systems. In other words, e-commerce sites such as book sellers or the like may often use one URL, for example "products.asp", in order to call up any number of pages showing different SKU's. Obviously the Hansen et al. method would not be able to derive a different report for each of those product SKU's since the SKU's do not carry a unique URL per page.

In this respect, the applicant's method of writing a unique identifier for each page solves this deficiency of Hansen et al. As more fully explained in the specification, the applicant will tag each page with a custom identifier thus allowing the report server to return a unique report for each page. This system of actively tagging is neither taught nor suggested by the passive method of Hansen et al.

The applicant also respectfully traverses the Examiner's conclusion that steps (e) through (g) of applicant's claim 1 are anticipated by Hansen with reference to column 9, lines 24-37 of Hansen. Specifically, step (e) defines a method for comparing the page displayed in the first display frame with the first identifier such that the report file can determine whether the user has moved to a different page within the website. It is only when the user has moved to a different page in the website that the report file will then read a different first identifier and, from the report server, return a different report file.

Although the specification teaches a predetermined period of time in the range of 0.1 to 1 second, and preferably about 0.5 seconds, it may be helpful for the Examiner to take a different predetermined period of time to assess the claim and the citation of the Hansen et al. teaching. Strictly by way of example and not intended as an embodiment of the invention, if we were to define the predetermined period of time as 5 minutes, it is extremely feasible that the user will have moved to one or more different pages within the website before the report server returns a different report file for the second display frame. Thus, it is conceivable in that hypothetical example that the report analytic shown in the second display frame would not match the page displayed in the first display frame. In other words, without this synchronizing step, the fact that the user has moved web pages within the website has no impact on the analytics file shown in the second display frame.

In contrast, column 9, lines 24-37 of Hansen et al., replied upon by the Examiner, actively monitors the clicks and intercepts those clicks to ensure that once

the user has moved web pages, or left the website entirely, the record of the visit is updated or altered. It is that active step of intercepting the clicks which allows Hansen et al. to alter the visit information. Thus, the user cannot move within the website without Hansen et al. adjusting to recognize that movement.

As can now be seen by the Examiner, the contrast between the teaching in step (e) of claim 1 and the Hansen et al. reference renders the citation of Hansen et al. under 102(e), with respect to this step, inapplicable. Hansen et al. does not teach the synchronizing method described by the applicant in step (e).

In view of the foregoing, it can now be seen that the Hansen et al. reference does not anticipate claim 1 of the present application, as amended. Similarly, with comparable amendments to claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that the arguments set out above apply equally to claim 7 and thus claim 7 is also not anticipated by Hansen et al. pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

In the circumstances, the objection to the dependent claims 2-6, 8-14 and 17-19 is also traversed.

With respect to the objection under 35 U.S.C. 103 to claims 15 and 16, again Hansen et al. does not teach the synchronizing method set out in step (e) of claim 7 and therefore it cannot be said that claims 15 and 16, depending from claim 7, can be obvious in view of Hansen et al.

Appl. No. 09/855,560
Amdt. dated July 30, 2004
Reply of Office Action of March 30, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendments, and submissions, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
WATCHFIRE CORPORATION



By:

Dinesh Agarwal, Reg. No. 31,809
Mitchell B. Charness, Reg. No. 46,416

Law Office – Dinesh Agarwal, P.C.
5350 Shawnee Road, Suite 330
Alexandria, Virginia 22312
Telephone: (703) 642-9400
Facsimile: (703) 642-9402

DA/jv